DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 279 621 SP 028 558

AUTHOR	Sutton, James H.
TITLE	Coping with Carnegie. The Response of a State Teachers' Organization to the Carnegie Report "A Nation Prepared."
INSTITUTION	Iowa State Education Association, Des Moines.
PUB DATE	15 Mar 87
NOTE	22p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Change Strategies; *Educational Change; *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Moral Values; *Teacher Associations; Teaching (Occupation)
IDENTIFIERS	National Education Association; *Nation Prepared (A)

ABSTRACT

This paper summarizes the Carnegie Report, "A Nation Prepared," without editorial comment; evaluates the report from the point of view of the organized teachers' profession, on both positive and negative aspects; outlines the strategy of the National Education Association in endorsing the report and the consequences of that endorsement; recommends a strategy for state and local teachers' organizations toward the report; and provides information relating to the implementation of this strategy in Iowa. Moral shortcomings of the report are considered as well as moral strengths. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED279621

COPING WITH CARNEGIE

The Response of a State Teachers' Organization To the Carnegie Report, "A Nation Prepared."

by Jim Sutton,
Administrative Lobbyist,
The Iowa State Education Association.

March 15, 1987.

Introduction.

This paper summarizes the content of the Carnegie Report, without editorial comment, from Carnegie materials; evaluates the Report from the point-of-view of the organized teaching profession, on both positive and negative aspects; outlines the strategy of the National Education Association to the Report and its consequences; recommends a state-level Association strategy; and provides information relating to the implementation of this strategy in Iowa. Portions of this paper dealing with the summary of the Report, its advantages and its deficiencies have been reviewed by staff of the National Education Association and the Carnegie Forum for Business and Industry. Opinions are those of the author.

I. Summary of the Report.

The Carnegie Report, "A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century," is based on the idea that re-establishing adequacy in schools will not be enough. Schools must be redesigned for the economic and social conditions of the 21st Century. To remain competitive, America must shift its economy from goods to knowledge. Americans' work will shift from rote to higher order skills. Work involving higher order skills is more complex and increases interdependency. Increased interdependency requires a broadening knowledge of events to maintain democracy in a technocracy. A new system of education will be necessary to insure the competitiveness of our economy; the competence of the workforce; and the health of democracy.

Radical Change Required.

The development of such a system requires radical rather than incremental change. It demands a new design based on new

SP 028 558

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. H. Sutton

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

incentives. Such a transformation necessitates a systems approach rather than piecemeal reform. A systems approach will transform schools; a piecemeal approach will merely congest them and produce gridlock. We must break out of political and educational gridlock by taking a systems approach to reform. The systems affected are schools, teacher education programs, professional standards, teacher compensation, and community relationships.

Demographic Trends Clear & Convincing.

In support of its argument, the Report offers the following demographic trends. The postwar baby boom is has produced an increase in enrollments. Meanwhile, a teacher shortage is imminent. This is because teachers have other career opportunities as a result of a growing shortage of labor and low salaries for teachers. This affects women and minorities. Many fewer women and minorities are remaining in teaching or electing to enter it. The number of minority students is increasing as the number of minority teachers is declining.

Lowering of Standards Imminent.

If these trends continue, the Report predicts there will be lower standards. The quality of schools will decline. Certification requirements will be relaxed as qualified people cannot be found. Teachers will be teaching increasingly out of their major areas of academic competency. There will be lower morale and decreased retention. The best teachers will leave teaching. Fewer academically talent students will opt for teaching as a career, and "Students entering college will vote with their feet to avoid teaching." There will be more teachers from the least qualified pool of applicants. Consequently, there will be an accelerating reduction in the quality of education at all levels. The result will be economic, political, social and cultural decline. If we populate our schools with teachers who go through the motions but are not effective, we will not remain sound as a nation in the 21st Century.

Key to Future is Improvement of Teaching Environment.

To remain sound, we must attract the best and the brightest to teaching. The only way to do this is to alter the professional environment in which teaching occurs. It is also necessary to broaden the profession by opening it to graduates of colleges of arts and sciences. The Report's general strategy for achieving this is by raising standards for teachers. It would achieve this objective by strengthening the educational preparation of teachers; revamping the compensation system of

teachers; restructuring schools to make teaching more effective, productive, rewarding and attractive; encouraging communities to set goals for school performance, to which teachers can commit themselves and for which they are held accountable; and mobilizing the nation's resources to prepare minority youngsters for teaching careers.

National Certification Board Proposed.

To propel these reforms, the Report proposes to establish "a National Board for Professional Teaching." This board would establish and maintain high standards of teaching; develop new methods of assessing teachers in both subject-matter competency and the art of teaching; issue certificates at two levels of competency; work with institutions which prepare teachers to assist them in preparing candidates for certification; have a majority of its members elected by those who who have been certified by the Board; provide a mechanism for assessing candidates through regional organizations; provide standards of competency which will serve as a guidelines when teachers are hired; and provide a mechanism for comparing competency in the workforce among states. This Board would be concerned only with certifying skills on a voluntary basis, at first. Later, states would include Board standards in their own standards, thereby making them compulsory. States would remain responsible for issuing a compulsory license.

Academic Ranks Needed in Schools.

Because of teacher shortages and the challenge facing us, schools must be restructured to make the best use of teachers. The Report proposes two levels of responsibility within each school's faculty: Teachers and lead teachers. Teachers will have additional paraprofessional assistance from a variety of other staff, including technicians and administrative staff, instructors and student tutors. Instructors would be persons holding only the Bachelor's degree, without preparation in education. They would obtain their education courses during their employment. Those who do not obtain full certification during the first five years of employment would be fired. Schools would practice differential staffing. Teachers would work together collegeally. Departmentalized structures and patterns of individual practice would change. Teachers would be empowered to take responsibility for the learning environment at the building level.

Reform of Teacher Preparation Programs Also Needed.

Higher standards of teacher preparation will also be required. To realize these standards, undergraduate education majors

must be phased out. All teachers, including elementary teachers, will have a bachelor's degree in the arts and sciences. A Master in Teaching degree will be created. The function of teacher preparation will be to teach teachers how to deal with real life situations in clinical practice. Internships and supervised residency programs in local districts will be required of all candidates. Any college graduate in arts and sciences -- including mature people in other industries -- could take the Master in Teaching program or enter teaching by an approved alternate path. Persons entering by an alternate path would be required to meet standards at least as high as those entering by traditional routes. The potential pool of well educated people who could become teachers will be greatly expanded.

Higher Salaries Essential.

Because education is a complex system, higher standards, a professional teaching environment and stronger preparation programs will not suffice to attract qualified people to teaching careers. Salaries are too low to attract the 200,000 qualified teachers who will be needed by the year 1992. Therefore, the compensation system must be restructured to abolish the current system of paying teachers more for taking continuing education courses. This retructured system will be based on four factors: the level of Board certification attained; the level of responsibility in employment; experience (or seniority); and performance of students in an entire school against objectives which have been agreed upon.

Restructuring of Reward Systems Necessary.

As part of restructuring, the report proposes to increases base salary and decompress its range. It proposes additional compensation commensurate with other professions which require comparable education, such as accountants. It suggests opportunities for career advancement when achievement and responsibilities justify it. It requires reward systems which promote retention of experienced teachers, and notes that salary schedules with 10-12 steps are partially responsible for the fact that half of all teachers leave the classroom by the end of the seventh year or service. Above all, higher performance must be linked to better compensation.

Real Role for Parents & Community Needed.

The Report believes that the local community must be brought into schools as partners in decision-making. This requires linking compensation with the achievement of agreed-upon goals. The

potential for progress by the studentbody must be discussed with the community and with educational leaders in each school. Annual goals are agreed to by teachers. Teachers are rewarded collectively if the goal is achieved. Extensive discussions occur between teachers and school officials to realize satisfactory methods for implementing this performance-based system which links goal-setting and compensation. Citizens are able to measure whether their investment in education is producing the desired results. Teachers are provided with incentives for working together creatively to meet the needs of all children in a school.

Commitment to The Disadvantaged Must be Maintained Throughout Reform.

The Report notes that higher standards can reduce participation by the disadvantaged. A democratic society can not support such a situation. To meet the challenge, the Report proposes that standards must be uniformly high for all teachers and prospective teachers. Standards must not be lower for minority teachers and prospective teachers, since this perpetuates the disadvantage of the disadvantaged. If anything, standards for the teachers of minority students may need to be higher because of additional skills which may be required.

Great Need for Minority Teachers Given Demographic Trends.

Higher standards for programs and teachers for minority students provide the best hope of breaking out of the cycle of poverty. Such programs will not be effective unless disadvantaged children encounter competent teachers of their own race. But the number of minority students in preparation programs is too low to provide minority teachers in numbers approaching parity with the percentage of minority children in the system. This means that co-operative programs among government, business, schools and higher education will be necessary to produce sufficient minority teachers. It also means that additional compensation for all teachers is necessary to attract and retain minority teachers.

Cost is Expensive, but Not Excessive.

Such innovations will be expensive, although part of the costs can be recovered through increased productivity. Such savings will occur not only in the schools, but in remedial programs in higher education and business, and in social costs such as welfare and criminal justice. But these savings cannot be realized without additional investment. Any improvement in education will also require additional investment. But over a

ten-year period, the total cost of implementing the Report's recommendations is no greater than setting support for public schools equal to the growth in the economy. Such a cost is affordable. But public and political will is necessary. Conversely, if public support and political will is not available and the investment is not made, the result will be a lower standard of living; a loss of economic power; the creation of a permanent underclass of disadvantaged citizens; and a threat to democracy.

II. Analysis.

The Carnegie Report is unlike other national reports. It calls for additional financial resources and provides a rationale for obtaining them. It seeks to impact politicians and has a strategy for doing so. It sees itself as extending, not repealing, the tradition of John Dewey. It recognizes the need for minority representation in schools and the profession. It identifies its mission as providing both equity and excellence, not merely for democracy and the economy, but for students. Unique among the national reports, it offers a coherent vision of the future and is willing to back its vision with hard cash. More than any other report, it takes a systems approach to our problems. It even anticipates its consequences. In short, the Report is sincere about doing something "for" education.

Excessive Haste.

One could still be critical. There were no working teachers on the task force. The Report's first draft was written before the task force's first meeting. A great foundation is trying to control events by lobbying, threatening its objectivity as a charity. And there is hype in the pronouncement that the Report is "round two" of educational reform. "Round one" isn't over. The "risks" in the "Nation at Risk" Report have not been corrected. And the Carnegie Report, like the others, understates what is good and overstates what is wrong. It gives little credit for incremental change which is underway. It advocates "radical" change, a revolution. One is reminded that revolution often exploits the powerless more efficiently. By seeking radical change, the Crnegie Reporrt, like its predecessors, seeks to do something "to" education.

What Carnegie Wants.

But mere criticism would be a mistake. After all, the report is advocating what teachers have been seeking for years. It is calling for a massive increase in spending to achieve

massive improvements; a professional salary for professional work as the only way of obtaining professional results and retaining skill in the workforce; a new curriculum for teacher preparation programs; and a new school structure which empowers teachers to take responsibility for the learning environment at the building level.

Congruent with the Association's Agenda.

Teachers and their organizations have sought these reforms for years and for the same reasons as Carnegie: to make teaching a true profession. Like Carnegie, we know they lack the prerogatives of other professionals. Teachers don't control entry, preparation, professional standards or the work environment. During the past fifteen years, the National Education Association, the American Federation of Teachers and their state affiliates have been trying to create a profession where none existed. They have been organizing to create power so as to pass laws which endow teachers with the prerogatives of professionals. Now that others have noticed the necessity of this task, it would be foolish us or our organizations to react petulantly or seem ungrateful.

Report has Problems.

It would also be foolish to ignore the Report's problems. Like the Holmes Report, it proposes to establish a single model of teacher preparation, the graduate model. It does so although today's elementary practitioners, prepared in undergraduate programs, are the most effective cohort now in practice. It doesn't say what will happen to professors who will be unemployed; the colleges which rely on teacher education students for survival; or the towns where these colleges are the only industry. It provides no research about the efficacy of the graduate model or mention of contrary evidence in recent "Master of Arts in Teaching" programs. Simple prudence suggests that the implementation of such a proposal should follow rather than precede demonstration programs and research.

Repeats the Holmes Report's Error.

Like the Holmes Report, Carnegie supports hiring persons to teach before they have begun teacher education programs. It is difficult to believe that a "teacher with ninety clockhours of preparation will be as effective as a teacher as a one with 7,260 clockhours of preparation and 720 clockhours of practicum. But that is what is being suggested as a way of achieving greater instructional effectiveness. In fact, what Carnegie is proposing is a lower standard than 48 states now

permit. If teaching is truly a profession and has an organized body of knowledge which is uniquely its own, surely one must know something about that body of knowledge before being admitted to practice. We do not allow BA's in biology to remove an appendix after 90 clockhours of surgical instruction. Teaching a child to read is considerably more difficult than removing an appendix. And it involves compassion.

Exporting Higher Education to K-12.

By its "instructor" concept, the Report is exporting the concept of teaching assistants from Higher Education to K-12. Like teaching assistants, Carnegie's instructors would have a Bachelor's degree only. Like teaching assistants, these persons would have no deep knowledge of an academic-subject matter, research methods or recent research. They would also know nothing about teaching. Like the Holmes report, the Carnegie Report advocates increasingly specialized roles for teachers, but finds no contradiction in simultaneously advocating less preparation for those in specialized roles. Carnegie seems to have accepted the Holmes recommendations uncritically and without reflection. This suggests a review procedure far less systematic than the claim to a systems approach implies.

A Failed Concept.

The use of teaching assistants in higher education is a failed concept. Teaching assistants now teach up to 50% of all contact hours of instruction in Colleges of Liberal Arts at our multiversities, and up to 60% in the lower (Freshman and Sophomore) division. This may be salutary for professors who do not wish to teach those who have the most to learn. And it generates an economic surplus which finds its way into the Graduate College for released time and research. But it is not salutary for the undergraduate student, who pays full tuition for a teacher and receives a substitute instead.

"Separate but Equal"is "Inferior."

The claim that "teaching assistants make up in enthusiasm what they lack in knowledge and experience" reaffirms that teaching assistants lack knowledge and experience. No one claims that teaching assistants are as good as those with regular faculty appointments. Such an argument, carried to its conclusion, means that advanced degrees and permanent faculty are unnecessary. And if the quality of K-12 teaching has declined, one reason may be the use of teaching assistants. The preparation of future teachers in courses taught by persons who know

neither the subject-matter nor how to teach it cannot be trusted to produce effective K-12 teachers.

Negative Reinforcement.

Consider "role modeling." Colleges of Education work diligently to instill good teaching habits and behaviors by example. Meanwhile, Colleges of Liberal Arts employ persons with no training, who undo professional courses by providing undisciplined instruction. The most effective (and least expensive) reform may be to utilize only faculty with regular appointments when providing instruction to future teachers.

Fallacious Logic.

While the Report's "instructor" concept will fill classrooms which may be empty because of a teacher shortage, it will not fill these classrooms with persons who can be effective on the first day of employment. This proposal will not improve teaching, except serendipitously, particularly at the elementary level, where the link between professional preparation and student learning is clear.

Moral Issue.

There are moral questions about exploiting "instructors" to support "lead teachers." Why should some teachers be paid less so that others can be paid more? Is teaching a "zero-sum" profession? Should all be paid what they are worth? Shouldn't all be fully qualified? Carnegie says "yes" to these questions, but except when it is speaking about "instructors."

"Instructors" Disfavor K-6 Disproportionately.

The "instructor" concept will affect K-6 disproportionately. This is because resources in a complex organization tend to gravitate toward the levels of greatest prestige. In Higher Education, for example, resources from whatever source tend to wind up in the Graduate College in the form of support for unsponsored research, a prestige activity. In the public school, we can expect the "B.A. only" instructors to accumulate disproportionately in the elementary school. This is the level at which preparation and experience are extremely important. It is also the level which is disproportionately female. The "instructor" concept means the least paid, least experienced, least tenured, least effective "instructors" will accrue at the level which is female.

"Lead Teacher" Concept.

The Report proposes the creation of a new class of teacher, the "lead teacher." These teachers would be empowered to make decisions about the local teaching environment and would be held accountable. These "lead teachers" are conceived as "instructional leaders" like effective principals. But rather than help principals transform their role from educational cop to educational leader, Carnegie is proposing a new class of practitioner which would be responsible for what principals are doing (or should be doing). The Report overlooks that "principal" is the short form of "principal teacher." The principals' organizations are justifiably upset. This is unfortunate because principals are a key element in restructuring schools.

A "Master Teacher by Any Other Name."

Ultimately, the Report's "lead teacher" proposal is "master teacher" by another name. It pays lip-service to those who believe that politicians must do something "to" teachers in order to do something "for" them. This view is based on public opinion polls. But opinion polls return answers only to the exact question which is asked. More precise polling indicates that the public will pay higher taxes to support education without extracting a pound of flesh from the profession. Carnegie and politicians should take heed.

Pyramid Structure Inconsistent With Carnegie Goals.

The "lead teacher" concept doesn't give responsibility to all teachers, but to a few. Thus, the Report maintains the pyramidal structure of authority in schools even as it advocates its elimination through collegeal structures. By proposing empowerment for an elite only, the Report is proposing relationships which are inappropriate for a profession which operates in a public setting and within the legal context which such a setting implies. Also, by imposing a structure on the profession from the outside, Carnegie, like the other reports, is preventing K-12 solutions from emerging from K-12 problems. This is an serious shortcoming. Applied to Abnormal Psychology, it leads to dependency. Applied to social policy, it leads to public welfare. Applied to teaching, it implies that public school teaching has no unique character of its own as a profession. This is exactly what Carnegie is seeking to amend.

Also a Moral Shortcoming.

Importing an entire professional structure from outside prevents teaching from locating, identifying and developing its own unique role. Teachers believe they have the right and the obligation to determine how their profession should be structured; other professions do. Yet the national reports assume teachers can't develop policy for their own profession. This leads to paradox: Carnegie is denying autonomy in the act of calling for it. This vitiates its moral authority. The result is not only inimical to reform, but bad politics: It ignores the consent of the governed. This has been known to lead to anomie or revolution. People react badly when they are treated as if they do not exist. After all, this is what propelled teachers into collective bargaining: being told they were professionals but being treated like personnel.

National Certification Board.

The keystone of the Report is a national certification board. This board would offer examinations, develop model teacher education curricula, certify practitioners, establish a code of ethics, and discipline practitioners for unprofessional conduct. Participation would be voluntary at first, but compulsory as the system becomes established. Licensure by the board would become the basis of compensation and assignments for teachers at the local level. Central to the mission of the board would be the development of tests. A majority of the board would be master teachers elected by master teachers in their regions; but business, schoolboards and politicians would be represented.

False Democracy.

Why? What do amateurs have to offer to the technical problems of professional preparation? Is there a qualified public interest in what is required to qualify for a teacher of reading beyond what teachers of reading stipulate? Do we ask businesspeople to decide what a surgeon needs to know to take out an appendix? When applied to any other profession, the concept is ludicrous and insulting. Why does Carnegie suggest it for teachers?

The answer is that Carnegie is carrying out its objective: to reform schools for the sake of business. Therefore, it seeks representation for business. But by doing this, it perpetuates disenfranchisement. If Carnegie means to transform teaching into a true profession out of teaching, it must empower --

trust -- teachers to control their profession in all plenary forums and to exclude those who are not licensed. The NEA's President Mary Futrell has been diligent in raising the issue of having a majority of teachers on all licensing bodies.

Other Problems with National Certification.

It would be rash to say that no formal test of teaching effectiveness can be developed, but one is entitled to doubt it. Also, the Report is unsure about how state and national licensure should interface, although it is sure that they should. And opting for national licensure could reduce the profession's autonomy in the states, since teachers can have substantial influence over state standards. Carnegie is now working to solve these problems in its planning group for the National Licensing Board.

Positive Aspects.

A national standards board could raise the quality of teachers in certain states. It could provide order to conflicting state requirements. It could help provide dignity and respect to those who make teaching a life-long career. It could strengthen teacher education programs and liberal arts programs. It could eliminate substandard programs, as state licensure and voluntary national accreditation have failed to do.

Negative Aspects.

But it could also encourage policy-makers to opt for a quick fix instead of new resources. Raising standards is inexpensive; it shifts costs to practitioners. Many states have taken this approach, some to their regret. For raising standards without raising salaries reduces standards. This is because education is a state monopoly which doesn't operate on the basis of supply and demand. If qualified people can't be found to fill classrooms, unqualified people will be found. By emphasizing licensure as its main proposal, the Carnegie Report may be giving politicians an easy out.

Short-term Strategy.

It is worth noting that the Reagan Administration opposes national licensure at this time. And it is difficult to imagine a board of standards without a federal role, unless Carnegie expects teachers to pay for its innovation. In other words,

a national standards board is a longshot. Yet, Carnegie has made this its centerpiece, linking it with proposals in many other areas. This may be the most serious point against it. If national licensure is not realized, many of the Report's recommendations may be jeopardized. A surer strategy might have been to emphasize professional compensation or reduced class size as surer methods of improving education on a systems-wide basis. It is not prudent to base a systems approach to reform around an institution which does not exist. But proposing novelty guarantees public and professional attention, 'though I doubt the ends of public relations justify the means.

Cause and Effect Confused on Salary Schedules.

The report suggests that present compensation structures are dysfunctional. Quite the opposite is the case. Such structures are highly adaptive to today's corporatized schools. Step salary schedules exist because we have step-structured schools. "Merit" compensation models don't work. They don't work because they seek to reward behaviors which are not supported by step structured schools. Before we have viable "merit" compensation, we must have schools which empower teachers to take responsibility for the learning environment at the building level based on effective clinical practice and with sufficient resources to carry out the task. Carnegie recognizes this principle elsewhere in its "systems approach" for "radical" change. Indeed, the "radical" change which Carnegie is calling for is precisely the transformation of schools along the lines outlined here. But on the compensation issue, Carnegie abandons logic in favor of the political hype in fashion since the "Nation at Risk" Report.

Reality in Reforming Reward Systems.

New compensation patterns will rise in response to changes in the structure of schools, not in anticipation of them. When compensation patterns are changed in the kind of schools we now have, the new compensation system fails. This has been the experience in Tennesee and wherever they have been tried. While "merit pay" on a building basis has merit -- provided each building sets its own goals (with appropriate review), new salary structures will not replace old step-structured ones until schools are transformed. Not until schools are reformed can teachers be evaluated on the basis of behaviors which the environment is capable of supporting. Carnegie's notion that compensation systems can be changed prior to changing schools and in order to change schools is wrong. It is also likely to be prejudicial to good order. For by favoring radical over incremental change, it is attempting to do more good than the infrastructure can bear.

"Liberal Arts" are not "Liberal Education."

Liberal Arts are not organized to encourage students to relate culture to society or themselves. They are organized to provide pre-professional preparation for university careers in academic disciplines, particularly in the Humanities and Social Sciences. Liberal arts programs are programs which assume that thei students are preparing to become professors. But less than ten percent of undergraduates enter graduate school. This narrow pre-professional bias -- based on the self-interest of national academic subject-matter organizations -- may provide some vertical integration with the K-12 curriculum. But it provides little horizontal integration. In plain words, liberal arts programs do not provide culture in a form which is usable for K-12 students. Pickled culture in an atmoposphere of academic mandarinism will not do for those who will be teaching such students.

Slightly Off-Center.

Carnegie is off the mark when it suggests that excellence can come at the expense of equity in employment; that teacher education programs can be transformed without attending to research; that the profession can be improved by allowing a permanent underclass of teaching assistants to practice on children without professional preparation; that teaching should be the employer of last resort for otherwise unemployable liberal arts graduates or a form of VISTA-like volunteerism; that liberal arts, with its emphasis on pre-professional education, is synonymous with usable culture; or that empowerment can be achieved by giving "lead teachers" rights and others responsibilities. Despite good intentions, such proposals won't increase standards or retention; they will reduce them.

Hard Work Ahead.

These problems can be ironed out, if teachers are trusted to make decisions as the Report hits the states. Governors need to understand that they can't impose reforms on teachers. Recent events in Tennessee show the futility of the scapegoat approach. Teachers are "part of the solution, not part of the problem. Reform will succeed only to the extent that it liberates the teacher from the dysfunctions of a corporate institutional setting which is so far out of human scale that higher

order professional skills routinely succumb to rote necessity. Education has become a prisoner of its institutions.

What is Necessary.

Leaders who want change must insure that major responsibility for implementing Carnegie is placed on teachers themselves. Teachers are their own best, most sincere and most severe, critics. But they have their pride, and their pride is professional. Teachers will not opt for change unless they are trusted to develop policy and apply professional judgment at all levels of practice and decision-making.

The Need for Partnerships.

Unless teachers opt in, reform will not succeed. The power of the veto is immense in such situations, and it can be wielded by any of the stakeholders. Politically, too, teachers have the largest voting block. While Carnegie staff can fly in for one day per year, education lobbyists are there daily. They represent thousands of practitioners who vote and contribute to election campaigns. In such a milieu, co-optation will not succeed. Consensus is necessary.

Short-cut cut short.

This is where Carnegie falls short. By not trusting teachers to determine the structure and priorities of teaching during its own decision-making cycle, Carnegie is perpetuating the condition which prevents teachers from operating autonomously in support of high standards. During its life to date, the Carnegie Forum on Industry and the Economy and its staff have treated the duly elected representatives of teachers as personnel, not professionals. If Governors follow this example, the result will be confrontation and obstruction. Such an outcome will serve the insincere only.

Moral Failure.

By not empowering teachers to transform their profession themselves, Carnegie is perpetuating the very distrust which has been part of our attitude toward teachers since Puritan ministers in Boston created the first schoolboard in 1635. They did not believe that lay educators at the Latin School possessed sufficient doctrinal purity to be allowed to make decisions about curriculum and pedagogy. Lay faculty were, and remain, illigitimate and suspect. Their legacy is school governance where oligarchy poses as Democracy. This result has not been salutary for an organization whose mission includes educating children

for citizenship in a democracy. Very few countries permit governing bodies to overrule practitioners in education. It is worth noting that, in the countries which do, the national government does not pay for local education. As Carnegie points out brilliantly, our nation, its institutions and our economy are beginning to pay the price for our failure to authorize teachers to practice their profession autonomously.

A More Serious Moral Failure.

A more serious moral failure is the Report's motivation. The Report of the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession is an adjunct of the Carnegie Forum on Business and Industry. Its theme is that education must be improved to make the world safe for our multinational corporations. Of course our nation needs a healthy economy, but we need it for the sake of people. When Carnegie says we must improve education for the sake of the economy, it is in danger of doing the right thing for the wrong reason.

The Devil and The Savior.

The New Testament speaks to this temptation. When Satan takes Jesus to the top of the Tabernacle, Satan offers Christ the world if Christ will do what Christ was sent to do. But if Christ yeilds to this tempation, He will be doing the right thing for the wrong reason. The result will be the destruction of the very moral authority which it is Christ's mission to fulfill.

And the Moral.

The moral is that, lacking moral authority, constructive change is impossible. The principle was as familiar to Ghandi and Mohamet as to the Twelve Disciples. It is also familiar to labor organizers, social reformers, environmental protectionists and others who promote "radical" change. It is not familiar to Carnegie. This is unfortunate because Carnegie needs to convince teachers of its idealism and because teachers are among the most idealistic people around. Teachers believe, for example, that they are here to educate children, not to make them good consumers or employees, except incidently. Those who seek change must protect their moral authority.

Statement of Policy Problem for Teacher's Organizations.

Despite its contradictions, counter-productive recommendations and occasional moral short-comings, The Carnegie Report

deserves good grades. It advocates what teachers want, and teachers should support it. Yet, it demonstrates little faith in the ability of teachers to find solutions to problems without outside direction. This is a self-fulling prophecy. Those who are not trusted with authority and responsibility do not exercise it. Carnegie's intentions are undoubtedly sincere and benign. It is working hard. We should be glad that it is. Teachers can use all the help we can get. How, then, should we response as an organized profession to Carnegie's initiative?

Options.

For a teachers' organization at any level, there are four, possible responses to the Carnegie Report. These are (1) Endorsement; (2) Endorsement with reservations; (3) Rejection; and (4) No action. There are logical arguments for each options. Which option best serves the teachers' interest?

The Teachers' Interest.

What is the teachers' interest? The teachers' interest is to make teaching a true profession, one which is recognized at law on the same basis as all other professions; to transform the learning environment from a bureaucratic to collegeal model; to provide students with the best possible education; to develop every students to the fullest, even the average child; to transform the learning environment so that teachers are empowered to practice their profession at the building level autonomously; to obtain professional pay for professional work; and to obtain the status and prestige befitting a profession. In short, the teachers' interest is to become the first mass profession of public employees since the Roman Legions.

The Association Connection.

The Association has been seeking to do these things for the past fifteen years. The NEA, at all levels, has been attempting to create a profession where none has existed. It has been working to create the formal perquisites of a profession by creating power so as to pass laws which confer the rights of a profession on teaching. And we have succeeded. After fifteen years, the Association has achived political power. It is now part of the Establishment. As the establishment, it must use its power carefully and responsibly. It must no longer react to criticism from outsiders. It must proact, set the agenda and carry others along. It can no longer advocate whenever possible, and mediate only when necessary. That tactic, useful for an outsider/underdog who always has something to gain, is counterproductive for the empowered insider, who always has something to lose.

Acting like a Profession.

Increasingly as power is achieved, the organized teaching profession must mediate whenever possible and advocate only when necessary, the reverse of our operating procedure when, as the underdog/outsider, we organized to achieve power and legitimacy. Our new organizational role puts a premium on co-operative effort and coalition. It is not in our long-range interest to be inflexible or to resort to raw power, except as a last resort when faced with intransigence. While we are still in the same business -- defending and promoting the economic and professional interests of members, our old business was advocacy; our new business is diplomacy. We cannot permit the alternative, which is the business of the bully. Those who fail to make the transition from outsider to insider, from advocate to mediator, from bullt to diplomat, will find themselves increasingly isolated from the main-stream of the profession regardless of organizational role, affiliation, or level. This is typical of periods of convergence in human affairs.

Historical Perspective.

Seen in this perspective, the Carnegie Report is not a "radical" threat to what we are about, but one extension of what we have been doing. We have been working to become a profession. Carnegie is working to help us become one. This means that rejection or inaction on the Report are not viable options for those who are sincere and informed about the Association's history and mission.

The Reservation Option.

It is possible to endorse the Carnegie Report with Reservations. This is the option selected by the NEA's President as her response to the Report. This course of action was appropriate at the time. The organized profession could not afford to be opposed to the Report. To do so would have made teachers "the bad guy" blocking educational reform, the view taken by the "Nation at Risk" Report. This was not in the teachers' interest.

Second Concern.

Also, the NEA was faced with taking action on a Report which its national and state leaders had not read and which they could not read because of Carnegie's short time-lines. Seen as an attempt to provide state leaders with maximal flexibility, the NEA

response was not only correct, but the only action which circumstance permitted.

Consequences.

But the NEA's action had consequences which were unintended. Endorsement with reservations made it seem as if NEA participation was reluctant. This influenced relationships with Carnegie. Also, having endorsed with reservations, the Association could not then enumerate additional concerns. This would have been interpreted as bad faith. For this reason, the NEA was not in a position to instruct its affiliates on a preferred course of action. The result of these developments left state affiliates to develop their responses to Carnegie individually.

One State's Response

Early in 1986, the Iowa State Education (ISEA) decided to review its options with respect to the Carnegie Report. On the basis of the above discussion, the Executive Board of the Association determined that taking no action would result in taking ourselves out of the game. Opposition was determined to be counter-productive because of our historical mission. There was also concern about the negative positioning which opposition would engender among the public, legislators and teachers on the reform issue. Also, the Executive Board felt that there was more good in the Report than bad, and that it deserved support since its objectives were, taken whole, more convergent than divergent with our own. On this point, the ISEA's President Ken Tilp said, "We should endorse Carnegie for the same reason that teachers join the Association, because there's more good in it than bad." This proved persuasive.

The "Reservation" Option.

Endorsement with reservation was considered at length. Since there were many problems with teh Report, why should we not enumerate such problems in an endorsement? But enumerating shortcomings would make it seem that we opposed the Report. Also, by endorsing the Report without reservations, we would be free to make suggestions constructively. This was important because of the inevitability that our Governor would seek to adapt the Report to Iowa. Working through problems in the development and adaptation phase would make us "constructive partners" by definition.

Endorsement Without Reservation Chosen.

The ISEA decided to endorse the Report without reservations. We did so to influence events during the adaptation and development phase. This is the phase where the Association's influence and "power of the veto" would be greatest. In other words, the ISEA decided to act like the Establishment to exercise the power which an Establishment has when "insider" events are occurring.

A Moral About Power.

The lesson is this: All we have to do to be a profession is to act like one. If state and local Associations decide to act like the Establishment, they will be the Establishment. If local teachers and their associations act like a profession, they will be a profession and enjoy its prerogatives. Initiative is the basis of all status. And legitimate status is what we have been working toward for years: to be consulted, in advance and with legitimate authority as full partners, on the matters which affect our economic and professional interests. This is why the ISEA became the first state Association to endorse the Carnegie Report and the first teachers' organization at any level to do so without reservation. I recommend this course of action to you as one which is in your organizational and individual professional interest.

Unanticipated Consequences in Iowa.

As a result of our activities on Carnegie, the ISEA suddenly began to appear in a new, constructive light to those who had traditionally opposed us. Suddenly, we began to look reasonable. (Halos of this kind often surround the Establishment.) Consequently (and not subsequently), Iowa's conservative Republican Governor initiated a salary reform program which would raise base salaries to an $18,000 minimum in 1987-88; increase salaries for all teachers by 11-17% each year for the next three years; and provide $50 million for programs in in-service, curriculum development, school improvement projects and experimental pay systems. On this latter issue, all these items are and will remain bargainable under Iowa's "final-offer" public employee bargaining law.

Style is Everything in the Establishment.

Iowa's reform approach, unlike earlier responses to the excellence movement, are not proscriptive on teachers and local schools. Its reform effort places the maximal responsibility on teachers and local districts. Iowa's politicians no longer see any value in attempting to polarize education or to isolate and exclude teachers from a role in determining the future course of education. We are no longer part of the problem; we are part of the solution. And we are part of the solution because that is where we positioned ourselves. Our state government is beginning to trust us, including its conservative Governor whom we did not endorse four months ago. That is what happens when teachers dare to be the Establishment, have courageous management, wise elected leaders, and sound advice from staff who understand establishment politics.

JAMES HERCULES SUTTON, the Administrative Lobbyist of the Iowa State Education Association, is responsible for representing the teaching profession to state government and for developing policies for the organized profession in Iowa.